

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 16-19, 23, and 24 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 6, and 22 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate limitations from claims 2, 3, 6, and 17. Claim 18 has been amended to incorporate limitations from claims 17 and 22. Support for these amendments may be found in the claims as originally filed. The remaining amendments have been made to provide proper antecedent bases for dependent claims. No new matter has been added.

Claims Rejections 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 5 and 21 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for reciting the limitation "timely manner." The Examiner's rejection has been carefully considered. Applicant respectfully disagrees because "timely manner," in the context of the specification, would reasonably be understood to mean that the information required is made available within a time required by the receiver of the information. Merriam-Webster's Dictionary, for example, defines "timely" as "falling within a prescribed or reasonable time." Receiving required information before the or by the time the information is needed would be understood by those in the art as reasonable, whereas receiving required information after it is needed would not.

Claims Rejections 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-6, 8, 12-14, and 16-22 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,769,013 (Frees). The Examiner's rejection has been carefully considered. In response to the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite limitations from claims 2, 3, 6, and 17. Applicant argues that this amendment to claims 1 and 18 overcome the rejections of claims 1 because Frees does not disclose or suggest a system or method for optimizing a processing chain

and/or a management chain for producing agricultural products in which a receiver generates question postings and a server generates answers to the question postings.


In the rejection of claim 17, the Examiner cites Frees, column 5, lines 40-45 as disclosing users comprising machines and/or businesses engaged in planting, caring for, harvesting, storing and/or processing of agricultural products; machine manufacturers; weather services; crop advisory services and planting advisors and wherein said required information includes data for optimizing a processing chain and/or a management chain for producing said agricultural products. Applicant has carefully reviewed Frees and has found no such disclosure. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frees in view of US 6,995,675 (Curkendall) and claims 7, 9-11, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frees in view of US 2002/0049727 (Rothkopf). The Examiner's rejection has been carefully considered. Applicant argues that the amendments to claims 1 and 18 overcome these rejections for the reasons stated for the rejections of claims 1, 18, and 17 under 35 USC 102.

The application in its amended state is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700